

REMARKS

With claims 1-10 being cancelled and new claims 11-14 added, claims 11-14 are now pending. Based on the amendments and arguments, the objections and rejections are traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested. (it is also noted that Applicants would be willing to submit any allowed claims to a terminal disclaimer in response to the obvious-type double-patenting rejections.)

Specification Objections

The specification was objected to because some acronyms were not defined. In response to this objection, the specification has been amended to add definitions where needed. It is pointed out that the specification already includes definitions for “SDC” (defined in ¶. 0005 as Silent Data Corruption) and “SRT” (defined in ¶. 0024 as Simultaneous and Redundantly Threaded).

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to the claims on various different grounds. It is believed that these objections have been addressed and are overcome with the cancellation of claims 1-10 and addition of new claims 11-14.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected all of the claims as anticipated by Rotenberg and Reinhardt et al. It is urged that the new claims are not taught or suggested by either reference. Neither reference teaches a process whereby threads to be redundantly executed are divided into multiple epochs (intervals) and then executed and compared in a bulk fashion using the epochs, as taught by Applicant and recited in the new claims. For example, Rotenberg discloses a system that

executes instructions and compares instruction results, instruction-by-instruction, which would be akin to having an epoch with a size of only one instruction.

On the other hand, with the use of Applicant's epochs, as taught and claimed, a bulk comparison of accumulated results at the epoch boundaries occurs, which is more efficient than comparing results instruction-by-instruction. Moreover, in some embodiments, Applicants teach only having to compare committed store results at the end of epoch instances, whereas the prior art references compare more if not all of the generated results from instruction execution.

Accordingly, the claims are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to pass this case to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512/238-7253.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-04-2007

/Erik Nordstrom, Reg. No. 39,792/

Erik R. Nordstrom
Registration No. 39,792